

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter in this application.

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Foster et al. (US RE 39,059, hereinafter “Foster”). For at least the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, Foster does not disclose one or more direct-execution instructing portion which instructs the electronic device to directly execute the target menu that is set as the direct execution menu **by pressing the setting portion and the direct-execution instructing portion simultaneously**. The Office Action states that Foster discloses one or more direct-execution instructing portion which instructs the electronic device to directly execute the target menu that is set as the direct execution menu (fig 11, label 1162; col. 11, 48-51; that “dad” in figure 11, label 1162 is direct-execution that executes a target from the menu). However, Foster does not teach or suggest that the target menu is set as the direct execution menu **by pressing the setting portion and the direct-execution instructing portion simultaneously**. Foster only discloses that the user selects an Add Screen command from the Tools menu to create a new screen object with the title Custom such as “Dad” (col. 10, lines 59-64). Therefore, since every limitation of claim is not taught by the reference, claim is not fully anticipated by Foster. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5 and 9-11 which are dependent from claim 1 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

Claims 2 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Foster in view of De Vito et al. (US Patent 6,452,616, hereinafter "De Vito"). For at least the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 2 which is dependent from claim 1, neither Foster nor De Vito discloses, teaches or suggests one or more direct-execution instructing portion which instructs the electronic device to directly execute the target menu that is set as the direct execution menu **by pressing the setting portion and the direct-execution instructing portion simultaneously**. The Office Action states De Vito teaches a setting change protection portion which regulates a change of a setting of the direct execution menu by a password. However, De Vito only discloses the use of a password for preventing access to some features of a decoder, such as a parental code or child lock. Although a rigid "teaching, suggestion, or motivation" test (TSM test) is not an appropriate test for obviousness inquiry, it is still required to show a reason for combining the elements in the manner claimed (KSR International, Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 1). Here, there is not reason for combining Foster with De Vito since neither Foster nor De Vito discloses, teaches or suggests one or more direct-execution instructing portion which instructs the electronic device to directly execute the target menu that is set as the direct execution menu **by pressing the setting portion and the direct-execution instructing portion simultaneously**. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Foster which does not teach or suggest that the target menu is set as the direct execution menu **by pressing the setting portion and the direct-execution instructing portion simultaneously** by a password taught by De Vito which is only used for preventing access to some features of the decoder.

Claims 7 and 8 which are dependent from claim 2 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 2.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Foster in view of Creamer et al. (US Patent 6,930,709, hereinafter “Creamer”). For at least the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 6 which is dependent from claim 1, neither Foster nor Creamer discloses, teaches or suggests one or more direct-execution instructing portion which instructs the electronic device to directly execute the target menu that is set as the direct execution menu **by pressing the setting portion and the direct-execution instructing portion simultaneously.** The Office Action states Creamer teaches the electronic device is a closed circuit television. However, Creamer only discloses CCTV as a source for supplying the digital images to the integrated Internet camera. Again, there is not reason for combining Foster with De Vito since neither Foster nor De Vito discloses, teaches or suggests one or more direct-execution instructing portion which instructs the electronic device to directly execute the target menu that is set as the direct execution menu **by pressing the setting portion and the direct-execution instructing portion simultaneously.** Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Foster which does not teach or suggest that the target menu is set as the direct execution menu **by pressing the setting portion and the direct-execution instructing portion simultaneously** by a CCTV taught by De Vito which is only used as a source for supplying the digital images to the integrated Internet camera.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our  
Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-36205.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:   
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

DATE: December 7, 2007